

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in the application, of which claim 1 is an independent claim. Claims 20-24 have been previously canceled.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,117,529 issued to Leising, *et al.* ("Leising"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Claim 1 recites *inter alia*:

A display using a photoluminescence quenching device, comprising...

an excitation light source for projecting light to the emitter layer ...

an electrical field formed between the first electrode and the second electrode which controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer.

Applicant respectfully submits that Leising fails to teach or suggest at least such features, more particularly, Leising fails to teach or suggest at least that the electrical field controllably quenches the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer. Rather, Leising discloses a conventional organic light emitting display with an electric field required for the onset of current, where the application of high voltages to the electric field produces field-induced tunneling of charge carriers from the electrodes into the polymer, which is the predominant

injection mechanism (See col. 13, lines 21-31), i.e. higher applied voltages create paths for charge carriers from the electrodes into the polymer, increasing the generation of exitons and increasing the emitted photoluminescence. In other words, Leising teaches the use of an electric field for increasing the electroluminescence of an electroluminescent color display screen, rather than use of an electric field for controllably quenching the photoluminescence light from the emitter layer, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Leising discloses the excitation light source of claim 1 in column 11, lines 46-49 (See Office Action on page 2, paragraph 5). Rather, Leising discloses a blue emitting diode, which emits blue light and converts the blue light into green and red light using a color conversion medium (CCM). Although the word "excite" does appear in Leising, Applicant contends that it is improper to imply the use of an "excitation light source". According to Leising, "blue light can be used to excite dye layers, whereby the blue light can be converted into green and red light." (See col. 11, lines 46-49). In other words, an emitter layer only emits blue light, and a dye layer (CCM) converts the blue light into green and red light. However, in the present invention, light generated by the excitation light source is not converted into green and red light; rather, the excitation light source is used to trigger the emitter layer to emit light. Accordingly, Leising fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-19. Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 28, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP:BYC:kbs